

issued to Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E, the licensee), for operation of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP), Units 1 and 2, located in San Luis Obispo County, California.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow a one-time extension of 3 months to the period for filing the subsequent revision to the FSAR to 9 months, rather than 6 months, after the completion of the Unit 2 seventh refueling outage.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated May 7, 1996, for exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.71, "Maintenance of records, making of reports."

The Need for the Proposed Action

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4), the licensee must file subsequent revisions annually or 6 months after each refueling outage provided the interval between successive updates to the FSAR does not exceed 24 months. The revision must reflect all changes up to a maximum of 6 months prior to the date of the filing.

Currently, licensees file their revision to the FSAR 6 months following the completion of their Unit 2 refueling outage.

The licensee proposes a one-time exemption to allow Revision 11 of the FSAR update to be filed 9 months, rather than 6 months, after the completion of the Unit 2 seventh refueling outage. The revision will meet the requirement to be current to within 6 months of the time of the filing.

An exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) is required to allow PG&E to complete its comprehensive review of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant FSAR update to ensure its completeness and accuracy and to incorporate any inaccuracies into Revision 11 of the FSAR update.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action. The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluent that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed

action does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and would have no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that the environmental effects of the proposed action are not significant, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative would be to deny the requested exemption. Denial of the exemption would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are identical.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statements for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant dated May 1973.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with NRC policy, on June 18, 1996, the staff consulted with the California State official, Mr. Steve Hsu of the Radiologic Health Branch of the State Department of Health Services, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated May 7, 1996, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the California Polytechnic State University, Robert E. Kennedy Library, Government Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of June 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Steven D. Bloom,
*Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-2,
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*
[FR Doc. 96-16268 Filed 6-25-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Docket Number 301-92]

Notice of Determinations and Further Monitoring: People's Republic of China's Implementation of the 1995 Agreement on Enforcement of Intellectual Property and Market Access

AGENCY: Office of the United States
Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice of determinations and
further monitoring.

SUMMARY: On May 15, 1996, based on monitoring carried out pursuant to subsection 306(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (Trade Act) (19 U.S.C. 2416(a)), the Acting United States Trade Representative (USTR) announced that China was not satisfactorily implementing the 1995 Agreement on Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights and Market Access (1995 Agreement) and requested public comment on a proposed action in response. See 61 FR 2500 of May 17, 1996. In addition, the USTR directed the Commissioner of Customs to limit, by date of export, entries of textile and apparel products listed in Annex II to the notice in the Federal Register. This action was necessary to prevent import surges and was taken pursuant to a determination under section 304(b)(1) of the Trade Act that expeditious action was necessary. On June 12, 1996, this limitation was extended for a further 30-day period commencing on June 14, 1996.

On June 17, 1996, the USTR announced that, based on the measures that China has taken and will take in the future to implement key elements of the 1995 Agreement, the proposed sanctions would not be imposed. In addition, the USTR determined to revoke China's designation as a "Priority Foreign Country" under section 182 of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2242). The USTR has also determined that the limitation on textile and apparel imports to prevent import surges should be terminated upon publication of this Notice and has directed the Commissioner of Customs accordingly.

The USTR will continue to monitor China's implementation of the 1995

Agreement, including the measures set forth in the "Report on China's Enforcement Measures" and "Other Measures" of June 17, 1996, pursuant to section 306 of the Trade Act.

EFFECTIVE DATES: USTR's determinations as to the termination of the import surge mechanism and revocation of China's designation as a priority foreign country were made on June 17, 1996, and are effective June 26, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Deborah Lehr, Deputy Assistant USTR for China and Mongolian Affairs (202) 395-5050 or Catherine Field, Senior Counsel for Multilateral Affairs (202) 395-3432.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 15, 1996, the USTR announced that based on monitoring carried out pursuant to section 306(a) of the Trade Act, China was not satisfactorily implementing the 1995 Agreement on Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights and Market Access (1995 Agreement). Pursuant to sections 301 (a) and (c)(1) and section 306(b)(1), the USTR proposed to impose increased duties on selected products of China and requested public comment on that proposed action. See 61 FR 2500 of May 17, 1996, for background on the announcement and proposed action.

To prevent import surge of products subject to quantitative restraints, pursuant to section 304(b)(1) and sections 301 (a) and (c) the USTR directed the Commissioner of Customs to limit the quantity of imports of the textile and apparel products listed in Annex II to that Federal Register notice. On June 12, 1996, the USTR extended her directive for an additional 30-day period commencing on June 14, 1996.

On June 17, 1996, the Chinese government confirmed that two documents of that date, entitled "Report on China's Enforcement Measures" and "Other Measures" are an accurate description of the measures that the Chinese government has taken and will take in the future to implement key elements of the 1995 Agreement. Based on this confirmation, on June 17, 1996, the USTR, pursuant to section 301(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Trade Act, determined not to impose the proposed sanctions and to terminate the directive to Customs limiting entry of certain products. In addition, pursuant to section 182(c)(1)(A) of the Trade Act, the USTR determined to revoke China's designation as a "priority foreign country."

Pursuant to section 306 of the Trade Act the USTR will monitor China's implementation of the 1995 Agreement, including the measures described in the documents of June 17, 1996. If, on the basis of this monitoring, the USTR considers that China is not satisfactorily implementing the 1995 Agreement or these measures, the USTR will decide what further action to take under section 301(a) of the Trade Act.

Irving A. Williamson,
Chairman, Section 301 Committee.
[FR Doc. 96-16320 Filed 6-25-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3190-01-M

Request for Third-Country Antidumping Investigation of Sodium Azide From Japan

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Request for written comments.

SUMMARY: On March 11, 1996 the Government of Canada, through its embassy in the United States, filed with the United States Trade Representative ("USTR") a request for the initiation of a third-country antidumping duty investigation with respect to sodium azide from Japan, pursuant to section 783 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1677n). The petition attached to the request alleges that imports of sodium azide from Japan are being sold in the United States at less than fair value (i.e., dumped), and that an industry in Canada is materially injured and threatened with material injury by reason of these imports. The petition alleges that ICI Canada Inc. is the sole Canadian producer of sodium azide. USTR invites comments from the public on the appropriateness of initiating a section 783 investigation with respect to sodium azide from Japan, on the substantive and procedural standards USTR should establish for the determinations of the Department of Commerce and International Trade Commission ("ITC") in such an investigation, if initiated, and on other issues that may be relevant.

DATES: Written comments from the public are due on or before 12 noon, on July 26, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Kane, Associate General Counsel, (202) 395-6800.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 232 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994 added section 783 to the Tariff Act of 1930 concerning

antidumping petitions by third countries. Under section 783, the government of a WTO member may file with USTR a petition requesting that an investigation be conducted to determine if imports from another country are being sold in the United States at less than fair value, and an industry in the petitioning country is materially injured by reason of those imports. After receiving a petition, USTR must consult with Commerce and ITC, provide an opportunity for public comment, and determine whether to initiate an investigation. Before initiating any investigation, USTR must obtain the approval of the WTO Council for Trade in Goods. The URAA Statement of Administrative Action (H.R. Doc. 103-316, vol. 11, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 845-6) ("SAA") notes that, in determining whether to initiate an investigation, USTR will take into account whether the petitioning country provides an equivalent opportunity to the United States to seek the initiation of an antidumping investigation.

Should USTR determine to initiate an investigation, it must request Commerce and the ITC to make determinations with respect to dumping and injury, respectively. If both determinations are affirmative, Commerce must issue an antidumping order in accordance with section 736 of the Tariff Act.

USTR is to specify the substantive and procedural requirements for the Commerce and ITC determinations. The SAA indicates that USTR is to develop consistent, transparent standards of general applicability that provide meaningful guidance to Commerce and ITC, while according them the necessary flexibility to develop appropriate procedures. With regard to procedural issues, USTR is to specify deadlines, persons who may participate in the investigation, and the applicability of requirements such as hearings and exchanges of information under administrative protective order. With regard to substantive issues, USTR is to specify the extent to which existing antidumping standards will apply, particularly with regard to the ITC's injury determination. In the SAA, the Administration stated its intention that the standards should, to a considerable extent, permit the ITC to incorporate by analogy existing standards concerning injury to a U.S. industry, but also noted that certain concepts, such as regional industry, may have little applicability in third-country investigations.

On January 16, 1996, an antidumping petition was filed on behalf of American Azide Corporation, the sole U.S. producer of sodium azide, pursuant to section 732 of the Tariff Act of 1930.